

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. IIDAP10.001AUS 1776	
09/844,155	04/27/2001	Takashi Miyoshi	IIDAP10.001AUS		
20995 7	7590 04/25/2003				
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP			EXAMINER		
2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR			IP, SIKYIN		
IRVINE, CA	92614	•	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			1742		

DATE MAILED: 04/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application No. Applicant(s		(3)	
Office Action Summary	Examin r		Group Art Unit	,
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	rs on the cover she	et beneath the co	orrespondence addi	ess
eri d for Reply	· _			
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET T F THIS COMMUNICATION.	O EXPIRE	MONTH(S	FROM THE MAILIN	G DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a real find period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state 	eply within the statutory n	ninimum of thirty (30) I from the mailing dat	days will be considered to	imely.
tatus , ,				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on $2/\iota\iota$ (o	3			
☐ This action is FINAL .				
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 193	for formal matters, p 5 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G.	rosecution as to 213.	the merits is closed	in ·
sposition of Claims				
Claim(s) 1 - 4 , 7	is/are	is/are pending in the application.		
Of the above claim(s) 7	is/are	$_{-}$ is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
□ Claim(s)	is/are	_ is/are allowed.		
Claim(s) 1 - 4	is/are	is/are rejected.		
□ Claim(s)		is/are	objected to.	
☐ Claim(s)				election
oplication Papers		require	ement.	
 See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawin 	ng Review, PTO-948.			
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on		ed 🗆 disapprove	d.	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are object	cted to by the Examin	er.		
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				
$\hfill\Box$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.				
riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)				
 □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority u □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of □ received. 				
received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numb	•	CT Bulo 1 7 2(a)\	·	
received in this national stage application from the Int	ernational Bureau (P	C1 hule 1 7.2(a)).		
_ ,				
□ received in this national stage application from the Int *Certified copies not received:				
□ received in this national stage application from the Int *Certified copies not received:	10 ¹⁰		·	
☐ received in this national stage application from the Int *Certified copies not received: ttachment(s)	10 ¹⁰	☐ Interview Sum	·	n, PTO-152
□ received in this national stage application from the Int *Certified copies not received: ttachment(s) □ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper N	No(s)	☐ Interview Sum	 mary, PTO-413	

U. S. Patent and Trace PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97)

*U S GPO 1998-454-457/97505

Serial No: 09/844,155

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 3. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 57056215 (abstract) or JP 54023031 (abstract).
- 4. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 06150722 (Table 1, samples 6 and 10 for compositions and Table 2 for IACS).
- 5. The cited reference(s) disclose(s) the features including the claimed Cu base alloys. JP 54023031 in abstract also discloses electrical conductivity and tensile strength. Therefore, the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have selected

Serial No: 09/844,155

Art Unit: 1742

the overlapping portion of the subject matter disclosed by the reference. Overlapping ranges have been held to be a prima facie case of obviousness, See MPEP § 2112.01, In re Best, 195 USPQ 430, and In re Malagari, 182 USPQ 549. Accordingly, it would have been prima facie obvious for an ordinary skill artisan motivated by a reasonable expectation of success to select the claimed range in order to obtain all of the known benefits. In re Venner, 120 USPQ 193 (CCPA 1958), In re LaVerne, et al., 108 USPQ 335, and In re Aller, et al., 105 USPQ 233.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The above rejection relies on the reference(s) for all the teachings expressed in the text(s) of the references and/or one of ordinary skill in the metallurgical art would have reasonably understood or implied from the text(s) of the reference(s). To emphasize certain aspect(s) of the prior art, only specific portion(s) of the text(s) have been pointed out. Each reference as a whole should be reviewed in responding to the rejection, since other sections of the same reference and/or various combination of the cited references may be relied on in future rejection(s) in view of amendment(s).

All recited limitations in the instant claims have been meet by the rejections as set forth above.

Applicant is reminded that when amendment and/or revision is required,

Serial No: 09/844,155

Art Unit: 1742

applicant should therefore specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP § 2163.06 (a) and 37 C.F.R. § 1.119.

Examiner Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Ip whose telephone number is (703) 308-2542. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 5:30 A.M. to 2:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Roy V. King, can be reached on (703)-308-1146.

The facsimile phone number for this Art Unit 1742 are (703) 305-3601 (Official Paper only) and (703) 305-7719 (Unofficial Paper only). When filing a FAX in Technology Center 1700, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other communication with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.

SIKYIN IP PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 1742

S. Ip April 21, 2003